

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS


Group I claims 1, 3-7 and 12-23 are elected for further examination. Claim 2 was previously canceled.

The restriction is traversed. Paragraph 2 of the Office Action mentions that the subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. See MPEP 806.05(d). However, contrary to Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, no reasons were given to show them to be separately usable.

As a consequence, the restriction requirement as between the subcombinations is without justification and warrants withdrawal since no showing was made that the subcombinations are separately usable in contrast to MPEP 806.05(d). Indeed, both subcombinations require machine readable code reading or bar code scanning and thus are not separately usable since they share such a common step. Further, contrary to Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the search required for Group II claims is required for Group I claims to be thorough, thereby further justifying withdrawal of the restriction. It is unclear how the patent examiner could decide patentability of the Group I claims without considering the art of adjusting inventory requirements of pills that include reading machine readable code.

Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Respectfully requested,


Robert Hess, Reg. No. 32,139